

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-10, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, and 26-60 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-60 are pending.

Disclaimers Relating to Claim Interpretation and Prosecution History Estoppel

Claims have been amended, and claims have been canceled, notwithstanding the belief that these claims were allowable. Except as specifically admitted below, no claim elements have been narrowed. Rather, cosmetic amendments have been made to the claims and to broaden them in view of the cited art. Claims have been amended solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, and the amendments were not necessary for patentability.

The claims of this application are intended to stand on their own and are not to be read in light of the prosecution history of any related or unrelated patent or patent application. Furthermore, no arguments in any prosecution history relate to any claim in this application, except for arguments specifically directed to the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 41-60 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 41-60 have been amended to overcome this rejection. This rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-60 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The independent claims, namely, claims 1, 21, 33, 37, 38, 41, 49 and 57 have been amended. This rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 21, 33, 37, 38, 41, 49 and 57 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 21, 33, 37, 38, 41, 49 and 57 have been amended. This rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-60 under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Cho *et al.* (USP 6,834,048). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Cho discloses a VOIP telephone system which allows a computer user to call through a computer to a telephone call recipient. Only two devices are involved in the teachings of Cho, a computer and the recipient's telephone or computer. As disclosed in Cho, Cho

provides audio communication between a personal computer 11 and an audio communication device 14. In operation, a local caller using computer 11, equipped with a sound card and headset, for example, uses a web browser to access and log onto web site 16 of an internet telephone service provider. After logging-on, the local caller provides the phone number of regular telephone 14 to web site 16, which then directs an Internet Telephone Service Provider (ITSP) gateway 12 to provide a voice connection between computer 11 and telephone 14.

Cho:3:6-15.

The claims as filed when read in view of the specification are patentable over Cho. Nonetheless, to make patentability of the claims readily apparent, the independent claims have been amended.

As amended, all of the independent claims, namely claims 1, 21, 33, 37, 38, 41, 49 and 57, recite a toolbar or toolbar software, a computing device, a first telephone and a second telephone. Cho fails to teach a toolbar of any kind. Cho fails to teach a computing device, a first telephone and a second telephone as claimed and/or performing the actions claimed. In addition, claims 1, 33, 37

41 and 57 as amended explicitly recite a two leg call. Support for this amendment is provided in paras. 0060 and 0091 of the application as filed. Cho fails to teach a two leg telephone call.

In view of the prior paragraphs, Cho fails to teach all of the limitations recited in the independent claims. Therefore, all of the independent claims, and all claims depending thereon, are patentable over Cho. As such, all claims are patentable over Cho and this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, independent claims 21 and 49 recite, among other limitations, in pertinent part, “scanning the web page data for associated data items included in an address book included with or accessible to the toolbar”, “identifying the associated data items found in the web page data as found data items” and “pairing a telephone number from the address book with each of the found data items”, as well as other actions involving “associated data items” and an “address book”. Cho fails to teach the claimed actions that involve “associated data items” and an “address book”. As such, Cho fails to teach all of the limitations recited in claims 21 and 49. Therefore, claims 21 and 49 and all claims depending thereon are patentable over Cho.

In addition, claim 38 recites, among other limitations, the toolbar software “identifying telephone numbers in the web page data as identified telephone numbers”, “ looking up the identified telephone numbers in an address book to create a found telephone numbers list” and “altering the normal display of at least one of the found telephone numbers to make the found telephone number conspicuous on the web page in which the found telephone number is included”. These limitations involve an “address book” and “found telephone numbers”. Cho does not teach an “address book” and “found telephone numbers”. As such, Cho fails to teach all of the limitations recited in claim 38. Therefore, claim 38 and all claims depending thereon are patentable over Cho.

Conclusion

It is submitted, however, that the independent and dependent claims include other significant and substantial recitations which are not disclosed in the cited references. Thus, the claims are also patentable for additional reasons. However, for economy the additional grounds for patentability are not set forth here.

In view of all of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested and allowance at an early date is solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned registered practitioner to answer any questions or to discuss steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark A. Goldstein
Reg. No. 50,759

Date: August 7, 2008

SoCal IP Law Group LLP
310 N. Westlake Blvd., Suite 120
Westlake Village, CA 91362
Telephone: 805/230-1350 x240
Facsimile: 805/230-1355
email: mgoldstein@socalip.com